Construction of Bridge over Krishna River near Tinthani.

Q.—1140. Smt. BASAVARAJESHWARI (Manvi).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal to construct a bridge on the river Krishna near Tinthani Village in Shorapur Taluk to connect Raichur and Gulbarga Districts by road ;

(*b*) if so, the stage at which it stands now and the time required to take up this work ?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) and (*b*) Alternative sites for constructing the bridge over the river Krishna are being investigated and work will be taken up as soon as possible after the site is selected and plans and estimates are approved.

Granting of House Sites to Harijans in Kollegal Taluk.

Q.—1407. Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the Harijans of P. G. Palaiyam in Kollegal Taluk have deposited amount in the Kollegal Sub-Treasury as desired by the authorities for the grant of house-sites and if so, when ;

(*b*) the reasons for the delay in granting house-sites ;

(*c*) whether they propose to take immediate steps in this behalf ?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) Yes, on 30th August 1955.

(*b*) The acquisition proceedings have not yet been completed now.

(*c*) Yes.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS.

Procedure with respect to Debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we take up the non-official resolutions I have to inform the House that 28 Members of this House have addressed a letter to me stating that in respect of these non-official resolutions the Speaker should adopt the procedure of permitting only two members to speak on each resolution, one from the Government side and another from the Opposition. Their idea evidently is to enable as many resolutions as possible to be disposed of.

It is obvious that not all resolutions are of the same importance. There are a certain resolutions of such importance that a large number of members would like to participate in the debate, just as there may be other resolutions of some limited character. It will be an interference with the right of the Hon'ble Members of this House if the Speaker should limit the debate to only two participants. The time that should be allotted for any particular resolution or the number of Hon'ble Members who should take part in the debate on any particular resolution are matters which largely depend on the Hon'ble Members themselves. Where, in the opinion of the House, there has been sufficient debate, the rules provide for moving of a closure motion and if the Presiding Officer is also of the opinion that such a motion is not an abuse of these rules or an infringment of the right of reasonable debate, the motion will be put to the House and it is then for the House to decide whether there has been sufficient debate on any particular resolution. To arbitrarily fix, with respect to each resolution, irrespective of its character, that not more than two members should participate in the debate is, in my opinion, an infringement of the right of reasonable debate and an interference with the rights which the Hon'ble Members possess. So far as the time limit for speeches is concerned, there is no doubt that the Speaker has a right to prescribe the time that each member should take. Even here, no